

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that claims 1-6 are allowed. The Examiner has also accepted the previously submitted terminal disclaimer, and has indicated it has been recorded. Claims 10-20, however, have been objected to for certain informalities, and appropriate correction has been required. Further, claims 7 and 10 have been rejected for being anticipated by Roser (U.S. Patent No. 6,102,896), and claims 8 and 9 (which depend from claim 7) have been objected to for depending from a rejected claim.

In response, Applicant has amended claim 7 to include the limitations of claim 8, and thereby present a claim (i.e. amended claim 7) the Examiner has indicated would be allowable. Along with the amendment of claim 7, claim 8 has been canceled, and claim 9 has been amended to appropriately depend from claim 7. Also, to overcome objections presented by the Examiner, claims 10, 11 and 14 have been amended to establish proper antecedent basis.

Amendments to the claims have been made to improve the readability of the claims, to more clearly define the structure of the invention, and to point out the features that distinguish this invention over the cited art. Claims 1-7 and 9-20 remain pending.

Claim Objections

Claims 10-20 have been objected to for having insufficient antecedent basis for certain limitations, specified by the Examiner.

In response, claims 10, 11 and 14 have been amended as required by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant believes the basis for objecting to claims for having insufficient antecedent basis has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 7 and 10 have been rejected for being anticipated by Roser (U.S. Patent No. 6,102,896). The Examiner, however, has indicated that claims 8 and 9 (both depend from claim 7), though objected to, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. This has been done. Specifically, claim 7 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 8. Claim 8 has been cancelled. And, claim 9 has been amended to properly depend from claim 7. Claim 10, is now dependent from an amended claim 7 the Examiner has indicated would be allowable.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant contends the basis for rejecting claims for being anticipated by Roser has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-7 and 9-20 are patentable for the reasons set forth above, and that the application is now in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at 619-688-1300 for any reason that would advance the instant application to issue.

Dated this 27th day of December, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



NEIL K. NYDEGGER
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 30,202
Customer No. 23862

NYDEGGER & ASSOCIATES
348 Olive Street
San Diego, California 92103
Telephone: (619) 688-1300